



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/756,830	11/20/96	BEAMAN	B Y0995-023X

MM41/0522

DANIEL P MORRIS
IBM CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPT
P O BOX 218
YORKTOWN HEIGHTS NY 10598

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2858


DATE MAILED:

05/22/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. 08/756,830	Applicant(s) Beaman et al	
Examiner Vinh P. Nguyen	Group Art Unit 2858	

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 10, 1998

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 2-16, 19-23, 36, and 38-49 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) 2-15, 19-21, 23, 43, 45, 47, and 48 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☒ Claim(s) 36 and 38-42 is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 16, 22, 44, 46, and 49 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2858

1. Claims 41 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 41, it appears that this claim has improper dependency because it can not depend on itself. In claim 49, "said plurality of probe tips" and "enlarged tip" have not been recited previously, therefore these terms are indefinite.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 44 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beaman et al (Pat # 4,998,885).

Beaman discloses an elastomeric area array interposer (as shown in figure # 5) having a substrate (20), a plurality of conductive members (23,30,40,50) on the surface of the substrate (20) and a sheet of material (60) with a plurality of openings disposed for alignment with the conductive members (23,30,40,50). It is noted that each of the members has an enlarged base

Art Unit: 2858

(23, ball shaped contact), an elongated electrically conductive member (40) in contact with the base and extending away from the base, and a contact end (50).. As to claims 44 and 46, it would have been well known for one of ordinary skill in the probe art to coat the contact ends (50) with two layers selected from the group consisting of Cr, Ti, TiN, Ni, Zr, ZrN, Co, Pt, Ir, Rh, Ru and Pd in order to have a better conduction and durable contact ends or tips.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 16 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zifcak et al (Pat # 4,793,814).

Zifcak et al disclose electrical circuit board interconnect having a substrate (16), a plurality of conductive contacts (36) disposed on a surface of the substrate (16), a sheet of material (13) with a plurality of openings extending from a first side to a second side of the sheet

Art Unit: 2858

(13), a plurality of conductive members extending through the plurality of openings of the sheet material (13) . It appears that each of the conductive members has an enlarge base and an enlarge tip end and this tip has a stud shape.

5. Claims 36 and 38-42 are allowable since the prior art does not disclose a detailed apparatus for making electrical contact with an integrated circuit device.

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16-18,22,36-42,44 and 46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Schadwill (Pat # 4,322,682) disclose a vacuum actuated test head having programming plate.

Swart et al (Pat # 5,493,230) disclose a translator fixture using a flexible pin retention sheet for holding the test pins

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CAR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2858

a shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CAR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


VINH P. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2858
05/18/98